

Gary E. Mason (pro hac vice)  
[gmason@masonlawdc.com](mailto:gmason@masonlawdc.com)  
Donna F. Solen (pro hac vice)  
[dsolen@masonlawdc.com](mailto:dsolen@masonlawdc.com)  
MASON LLP  
1625 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 429-2290  
Facsimile: (202) 429-2294

Michael F. Ram (SBN 104805)  
[mram@ramolson.com](mailto:mram@ramolson.com)  
RAM & OLSON LLP  
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 433-4949  
Facsimile: (415) 433-7311

[Additional Counsel listed on signature page]

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class*

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

EVA HIBNICK and ANDRANIK SOUVALIAN, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

## Plaintiffs,

V.

GOOGLE, INC.,

**Defendant.**

Case No.: 10-CV-00672-JW

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND PLAINTIFFS'  
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF  
PROPOSED PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 1;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR  
ENTRY OF PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 1**

Date: July 12, 2010  
Time: 10:00am  
Place: Courtroom 8, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
[Hon. James Ware]

**Original Complaint Filed: 02/17/10**

111

111

111

11

1           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT** on July 12, 2010 at 10:00am, or as soon thereafter as the  
 2 matter may be heard in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, 280  
 3 South 1<sup>st</sup> Street, San Jose, CA 95113, Plaintiffs will and hereby do move this Court for entry of  
 4 Proposed Pretrial Order No. 1 consolidating the above-captioned case with the related *Feldman v.*  
 5 *Google, Inc.*, 10-cv-01433 (N.D. Cal. April 5, 2010) action, appointing Mr. Gary E. Mason of  
 6 Mason LLP as Lead Counsel, Michael Ram of Ram & Olson LLP as Liaison Counsel, and  
 7 establishing a Steering Committee.

8           This motion is made on the grounds that (1) consolidation pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42 will  
 9 greatly promote the efficient adjudication of the instant matter and the *Feldman* case, which involve  
 10 identical issues of fact and law; (2) Mr. Gary E. Mason and Mr. Michael Ram are well-qualified to  
 11 serve as Lead Counsel and Liaison Counsel respectively pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(3); and (3)  
 12 the proposed Steering Committee will assist in the representation of Plaintiffs and the Class. All  
 13 affected parties' counsel, including those representing Plaintiffs in the instant action and the  
 14 *Feldman* case and Defendant, have consented to this motion.

15           This motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum  
 16 of Points and Authorities, and the Class Action Complaints on file in the instant case and *Feldman*.  
 17 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their motion and enter Proposed Pretrial Order No.  
 18 1.

#### 19           **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

20           Plaintiffs respectfully move for entry of proposed Pretrial Order No. 1 consolidating the  
 21 above-captioned case with the related *Feldman v. Google, Inc.*, 10-cv-01433 (N.D. Cal. April 5,  
 22 2010) action for pretrial purposes, appointing Mr. Gary E. Mason of Mason LLP as Lead Counsel,  
 23 Mr. Michael Ram of Ram & Olson LLP as Liaison Counsel, and establishing a Steering Committee.  
 24 As explained herein, consolidation, the appointment of Mr. Mason and Mr. Ram, and the creation of  
 25 a Steering Committee will fairly and efficiently advance this litigation in an organized manner that is  
 26 in the best interests of the Plaintiffs, the putative class members, Defendant Google Inc.  
 27 ("Defendant" or "Google"), and this Court. Notably, Defendant has provided its consent to this  
 28 motion and all of Plaintiffs' counsel have agreed to the organizational structure set forth in Proposed

1 Pretrial Order No. 1. Plaintiffs' motion should thus be granted.

2 **I. STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS**

3 Plaintiffs in both the instant case and *Feldman v. Google Inc.*, 10-cv-01433 (N.D. Cal. April  
4 5, 2010) have recently filed class action lawsuits in this Court against Google on behalf of a  
5 nationwide class of individuals whose privacy rights were allegedly violated by the actions of  
6 Google through its Buzz program.

7 In both actions, Plaintiffs allege that Google automatically added the Buzz service to the  
8 accounts of all users of Google's "Gmail" service, thereby making private user information publicly  
9 available without the users' knowledge or authorization. Both cases allege that in launching Google  
10 Buzz, Google failed to provide its users with clear information detailing the nature of the new  
11 service, including the automatic application of the Buzz program and its provisions for default  
12 disclosure of personal information. Plaintiffs in each action allege that Google's public disclosure of  
13 private user information violates users' rights under the Federal Wiretap Act, the Federal Computer  
14 Fraud and Abuse Act, the Federal Stored Communications Act, and California common law. As a  
15 result of these alleged breaches, Plaintiffs in both actions seek identical forms of relief.

16 **II. ARGUMENT**

17 **A. Consolidation for Pretrial Purposes Promotes the Efficient Litigation of  
18 Common Issues.**

19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a)(2) provides that the Court may consolidate actions that involve a  
20 common question of law or fact. Consolidation is also appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a)(3) to  
21 avoid unnecessary cost or delay. Here, as shown above, both the instant action and the related  
22 *Feldman* case involve identical core questions of law and fact concerning Google's public disclosure  
23 of personal user information through its Buzz application and its consequent effect on the privacy  
24 rights of its users. Given the plain factual and legal similarity of these two putative class actions,  
25 separate adjudication will certainly involve duplication in motion practice and pre-trial procedures  
26 and will thus result in unnecessary costs and inconvenience affecting Plaintiffs, Defendant and the  
27 Court. In order to avoid such inefficiency, Plaintiffs' counsel in both actions and Defendant agree  
28 that this case and *Feldman* should be consolidated for pretrial purposes.

1           **B. The Proposed Lead Class Counsel, Liaison Counsel, and Steering Committee**  
 2           **will Effectively, Fairly, and Adequately Represent the Interests of all Class**  
 3           **Members in this Litigation.**

4           As set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(3), “[t]he court may designate interim counsel to act on  
 5           behalf of a putative class before determining whether to certify the action as a class action.” In  
 6           appointing class counsel, the court must consider the following factors: (1) the work counsel has  
 7           done in identifying or investigating potential claims in the action; (2) counsel’s experience in  
 8           handling class actions, other complex litigation, and claims of the type asserted in the action; (3)  
 9           counsel’s knowledge of the applicable law; and (4) the resources counsel will commit to  
 10          representing the class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(A). Each of these factors supports the appointment  
 11          of Gary E. Mason as Lead Counsel and Michael Ram as Liaison Counsel in these action.

12           **1. Mr. Mason is Well-Qualified to Serve as Lead Counsel in the**  
 13           **Consolidated Action.**

14           Mr. Mason is a highly-skilled and experienced class action attorney who is more than  
 15          capable of litigating this action on behalf of a nationwide class. At even this preliminary stage of  
 16          litigation, Mr. Mason has already expended significant time and effort researching, investigating,  
 17          and identifying the claims belonging to Plaintiffs and putative class members. Mr. Mason has  
 18          invested the time to understand precisely how the Google Buzz service was introduced by  
 19          Defendant, how it works, and how it has affected Gmail users. Mr. Mason has also coordinated  
 20          counsel in the three related federal complaints filed to date.

21           Moreover, as detailed in his firm resume, Mr. Mason has extensive experience-- gained over  
 22          the course of twenty years-- representing plaintiffs in class actions. *See Exhibit 1 to Declaration of*  
 23          *Gary E. Mason in Support of Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Entry of Pretrial Order No. 1.* He  
 24          has successfully litigated a variety of complex class actions, including cases involving privacy and  
 25          civil rights issues similar to those present in the instant litigation, in federal courts throughout the  
 26          country. *Id.* Just last year, Mr. Mason, as court-appointed co-lead counsel, settled a nationwide  
 27          class action in the U.S. District Court of the District Columbia on behalf of veterans whose privacy  
 28          rights had been compromised by the theft of an external hard drive containing the names, dates of

1 birth, and social security numbers of some 26.5 million veterans and their spouses. *In re: Dept. of*  
 2 *Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litig.*, MDL 1796 (D. D.C.). There, Plaintiffs alleged violations of  
 3 the Privacy Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Fourth and Fifth Amendments. The  
 4 settlement resulted in the creation of a \$20 million fund for the affected veterans and a *cy pres* award  
 5 for two non-profit organizations. Mr. Mason is also involved with the proposed \$1.25 billion  
 6 nationwide settlement of a class action brought on behalf of tens of thousands of black farmers who  
 7 were denied equal access to U.S. Agriculture Department loan programs. *In re Black Farmers*  
 8 *Discrimination Litig.*, 1:08- MC- 0051 (D. D.C.).

9 Mr. Mason has served as co-counsel in a number of other complex class actions that have  
 10 been resolved in federal courts. *See, e.g., Ersler, et. al v. Toshiba America et. al*, 07-civ- 2304  
 11 (D.N.J. 2009) (settlement of claims arising from allegedly defective television lamps); *In re General*  
 12 *Motors Corp. Speedometer Prods. Liability Litig.*, MDL 1896 (W.D. Wash. 2008) (national settlement  
 13 of claims arising from allegedly defective vehicles); *Turner v. General Electric Company*, No. 2:05-  
 14 CV-186 (M.D. Fl. 2007) (settlement of claims arising from allegedly defective refrigerators);  
 15 *Galanti v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, No. 03-209 (D.N.J. 2003) (creation of \$330 million  
 16 settlement fund for payment of claims arising from allegedly defective radiant heating systems);  
 17 *Nnadili, et al. v. Chevron U.S.A.*, No. 02-cv-1620 (D.D.C. 2008) (\$6.2 million settlement for owners  
 18 and residents of 200 properties contaminated with petroleum products); *In re Synthetic Stucco*  
 19 (*EIFS*) *Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1132 (E.D.N.C.) (national class action involving  
 20 defective synthetic siding); *In re Swanson Creek Oil Spill Litigation*, No. 00-1429 (D. Md. 2002)  
 21 (\$2.25 million settlement fund to resolve litigation arising from largest oil spill in history of State of  
 22 Maryland).

23 Finally, Mr. Mason's law firm, Mason LLP, which consists of four attorneys, each of whom  
 24 has experience litigating class actions on behalf of plaintiffs, and a full staff, has more than sufficient  
 25 resources to litigate this case.

26                   **2.        Mr. Ram is Well-Qualified to Serve as Liaison Counsel in the**  
 27                   **Consolidated Action**

28 As recognized by Plaintiffs' counsel, Mr. Ram is similarly well-qualified and adequate to

1 serve as Liaison Counsel in this litigation. As a partner at the law firm of Ram & Olson LLP, Mr.  
 2 Ram has substantial experience litigating a variety of complex class action cases throughout the  
 3 nation, and notably, in this forum. *See, e.g., Keilholtz et al v. Superior Fireplace Co.*, 4:08-cv-  
 4 00836-CW (N.D. Cal.) (currently serving as co-counsel for the national certified class of half a  
 5 million owners of allegedly dangerous glass-pane gas fireplaces); *Chamberlain v. Ford Motor Co.*,  
 6 No. 03-2628 (N.D. Cal.) (settlement of nationwide class claims alleging defective plastic manifolds);  
 7 *Falk v. G.M.C.*, No. 1C07-1731 (N.D. Cal.) (settlement of class action involving allegations of  
 8 defective speedometers). Mr. Ram's experience is further and more fully enumerated in the Ram &  
 9 Olson LLP firm resume. *See* Exhibit 1 to Declaration of Michael F. Ram in Support of Plaintiffs'  
 10 Unopposed Motion for Entry of Pretrial Order No. 1.

11 Importantly, Mr. Ram and his firm are based in California and are thus able to quickly and  
 12 conveniently communicate with this Court as necessary. Like Mr. Mason, Mr. Ram has spent a  
 13 significant amount of time investigating and identifying the allegations and legal claims asserted in  
 14 this litigation. He is able and willing to commit the resources necessary to represent the Class.

15                   **3. The Steering Committee Will Further Advance the Efficiency and**  
 16                   **Fairness of this Litigation.**

17 Finally, Plaintiffs request that the Court approve the creation of the proposed Steering  
 18 Committee, which will provide support to Lead and Liaison Counsel and assist in the fair and  
 19 efficient litigation of this case. The Steering Committee is comprised of the attorneys who represent  
 20 each of the named Plaintiffs in the cases to be consolidated under proposed Pretrial Order No. 1.  
 21 Each of the members of the proposed Steering Committee has assisted with the investigation of the  
 22 claims belonging to Plaintiffs and Class Members, and is closely familiar with Google's alleged  
 23 misconduct. Counsel on the Steering Committee also have substantial experience with federal class  
 24 action litigation. The firm resume of each Steering Committee member is attached hereto as  
 25 Exhibits A through D.

26  
 27  
 28

1       **III. CONCLUSION**

2                  For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant entry of Pretrial  
3 Order No. 1.

4 DATED: May 6, 2010

RAM & OLSON LLP

5                  By: /s/ Michael F. Ram  
6                  Michael F. Ram (SBN 104805)  
7                  555 Montgomery Street, Suite 820  
8                  San Francisco, California 94111  
9                  Phone: (415) 433-4949  
10                 Fax: (415) 433-7311  
11                 Email: [mram@ramolson.com](mailto:mram@ramolson.com)

12                 Gary E. Mason (pro hac vice)  
13                 Donna F. Solen (pro hac vice)  
14                 MASON LLP  
15                 1625 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
16                 Ste. 605  
17                 Washington, DC 20036  
18                 Phone: (202) 429-2290  
19                 Fax: (202) 429-2294  
20                 Email: [gmason@masonlawdc.com](mailto:gmason@masonlawdc.com)

21                 Peter N. Wasylyk (pro hac vice)  
22                 LAW OFFICES OF PETER N. WASYLYK  
23                 1307 Chalkstone Avenue  
24                 Providence, Rhode Island 02908  
25                 Phone: (401) 831-7730  
26                 Fax: (401) 861-6064  
27                 Email: [pnwlaw@ao1.com](mailto:pnwlaw@ao1.com)

28                 Andrew S. Kierstead (SBN 132105)  
1                 LAW OFFICE OF ANDREW KIERSTEAD  
2                 1001 SW 5th Avenue, Suite 1100  
3                 Portland, Oregon 97204  
4                 Phone: (508) 224-6246  
5                 Fax: (508) 224-4356  
6                 Email: [ajkier@aol.com](mailto:ajkier@aol.com)

7                 Michael D. Braun (SBN 167416)  
8                 Braun Law Group, P.C.  
9                 12304 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 109  
10                 Los Angeles, CA 90025  
11                 Phone: (310) 836-6000  
12                 Fax: (310) 836-6010  
13                 Email: [service@braunlawgroup.com](mailto:service@braunlawgroup.com)

14                 ///

15                 ///

1 Of Counsel:  
2 William Rubenstein  
3 1545 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Phone: (617) 496- 7320

4 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class  
in the above-captioned case*

5 Jonathan Shub (SBN 237708)  
SHUB LAW LLC  
6 1818 Market Street, 13<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
7 Phone: (610) 435-6551  
Fax: (215) 569-1606  
8 Email: [jshub@shublaw.com](mailto:jshub@shublaw.com)

9 Christopher A. Seeger  
10 SEEGER WEISS LLP  
One William Street  
11 New York, NY 10004  
Phone: (212) 584-0700  
12 Fax: (212) 584- 0799  
Email: [cseeger@seegerweiss.com](mailto:cseeger@seegerweiss.com)

13 Lawrence Feldman (pro hac vice)  
14 LAWRENCE E. FELDMAN &  
ASSOCIATES  
15 423 Tulpehocken Avenue  
Elkins Park, PA 19027  
16 Phone: (215) 885- 3302  
Fax: (215) 885-3303  
17 Email: [leflaw@gmail.com](mailto:leflaw@gmail.com)

18 Eric Freed (SBN 162546)  
FREED & WEISS LLC  
19 111 West Washington Street, Suite 1311  
Chicago, IL 60602  
Phone: (312) 220-0000  
20 Fax: (312) 220-7777  
Email: [eric@freedweiss.com](mailto:eric@freedweiss.com)

22 Howard G. Silverman  
KANE & SILVERMAN, P.C.  
23 2401 Pennsylvania Ave., Suite 1C-44  
Philadelphia, PA 19130  
24 Phone: (215) 232-1000  
Fax: (215) 232-0181  
25 Email: [HGS@palegaladvice.com](mailto:HGS@palegaladvice.com)

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class  
in the Feldman action*